

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M-1. 52.217-4 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS EXERCISED AT TIME OF CONTRACT AWARD (JUN 1988)

(Reference 17.208)

M-2. 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

(Reference 17.208)

M-3. 52.232-15 PROGRESS PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED (APR 1984)

(Reference 32.502-3)

M-4. BASIS OF EVALUATION

M-4.1. General

M-4.1.1. This is a competitive source selection and will be conducted in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) (FAR) Part 15, Contract Negotiation, and applicable supplements. TMA intends to award one contract using full and open competition.

M-4.1.2. The Government has established a Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) to evaluate proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposals will be evaluated by the SSEB using the evaluation factors and subfactors identified below. Proposals which are unrealistic in terms of technical capability or are unrealistically high or low in cost may be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of a failure to comprehend the proposed contractual requirements and may be rejected.

M-4.1.3 The source selection resulting from this RFP will be based on the proposal representing the best value (which will include the risk associated with the proposal) to the Government, price and other factors considered.

M-4.1.4. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors. Therefore, each initial offer shall contain the offeror's best offer from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer determines discussions to be necessary.

M-4.1.5. The Government will review the offeror's written agreement, submitted as a condition of award, stating that it shall not offer in response to any solicitation, nor shall it be eligible for award of any contract, nor serve as a consultant or subcontractor to an MCSC, TDEFIC, TMA pharmacy contract, or DP. "Offeror" includes the prime contractor and all subcontractors.

M-4.2. Evaluation Approach

The Government will evaluate:

M-4.2.1. The extent to which the proposal exhibits a clear understanding of the work requirements and the means required to fulfill the requirements.

M-4.2.2. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates an ability to meet the requirements defined in the RFP and the quality of service which is likely to result from implementation of an offeror's proposed methods. Enhancements proposed by the offeror will be considered.

M-4.2.3. The likelihood of the offeror satisfactorily performing all RFP requirements within the price proposed.

M-5. EVALUATION FACTORS

M-5.1. Evaluation factors and subfactors are:

M-5.1.1. Factor 1 - Management

MDA906-03-R-0004

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Subfactor 1 - Privacy and Security

Subfactor 2 - Management

Subfactor 3 - Staffing

Subfactor 4 - Internal Quality Management Program (IQMP)

M-5.1.2. Factor 2 - Technical Approach

Subfactor 1 - Case Reviews

Subfactor 2 - Facility Certification

M-5.1.3. Factor 3 - Past Performance

M-5.1.4. Factor 4 - Price

M-6. EVALUATION FACTORS RELATIVE VALUES

M-6.1. Management is the highest weighted factor. The Technical Approach factor is less important than the Management factor but more important than the Past Performance factor. All evaluation factors, other than Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

M-6.2. Proposal risk will be considered by the Source Selection Authority (SSA) in making the best value award determination, and will consider the risk associated with the entire proposal.

M-6.3. Offerors should be aware that if competing proposals are determined essentially equal in terms of non-price factors, the Government may determine that the best value decision is the offer with the lowest price. Additionally, the Government may make tradeoffs between factors addressed in the technical proposal, past performance, and price when determining which offer constitutes the best value to the Government. This tradeoff process may result in an award to other than the low price offer or other than the proposal with the highest non-price factor rating.

M-7. PROPOSAL RISK EVALUATION

Proposal risk relates to the identification and assessment of the risks associated with an offeror's proposed approach to performing the requirements of this solicitation. Proposal risk may be associated with a particular approach, or proposed process, as it relates to the successful achievement of the Government's requirements and the ability to meet the Statement of Objectives, or the degree to which the Government must expend resources to monitor or manage the risk to avoid unsuccessful performance. Proposal risk will be considered in making the best-value analysis for award. Proposal risk will be considered at the Management and Technical Approach factor levels in evaluating trade-off possibilities and determining the best-value proposal. Proposal risk may also be impacted by the amount of related experience demonstrated by the offeror.

M-8. EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT

M-8.1. In order for a proposal to receive consideration under this evaluation factor, the offeror must submit the subcontracting plan (unless the offeror is a small business). The Government will evaluate all plans submitted. This evaluation will be considered in the overall Management factor rating. Failure to address any of the specified management subfactor requirements will be considered a deficiency.

M-8.1.1. Factor 1 - Management, Subfactor 1 - Privacy and Security

M-8.1.1.1. Pass/fail evaluation based on the written proposal.

M-8.1.2. Factor 1 - Management, Subfactor 2 - Management

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M-8.1.2.1. The Government will assess the offeror's ability to manage contractor and subcontractor operations, as they pertain to the offeror's proposal, in a manner that will ensure the successful operation of all work associated with the requirements of the RFP. The offeror's management strategies as they apply to the SOW will be assessed. The offeror's management structure, lines of authority, and the reporting interfaces between the offeror and the Government will be evaluated.

M-8.1.2.2. The offeror's proposed process and plans to prepare the required reports will be evaluated. The offeror's plans for preparing, reviewing, and submitting the required reports (i.e., monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, and Clinical Quality Management Program (CQMP)), in addition to its approach to preparing final determinations on responses from MCSCs and DPs, will be assessed.

M-8.1.2.3. The offeror's approach for obtaining appropriate staff to conduct on-site facility reviews will be evaluated, including an assessment of the offeror's ability to provide the appropriately qualified staff.

M-8.1.2.4. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach and process for ensuring comprehensive, independent, and objective reviews. The offeror's ability to document these reviews in a comprehensive manner will be assessed.

M-8.1.3. Factor 1 - Management, Subfactor 3 - Staffing

M-8.1.3.1. The Government will evaluate the offeror's rationale for concluding that it has an adequate number of licensed, board-certified, actively-practicing physicians reviewers in all ABMS or BOS specialties, and non-physicians reviewers, to perform the required work.

M-8.1.3.2. The offeror's qualifications for first-level reviewers, who will be applying InterQual and ASAM criteria, will be evaluated. The offeror's rationale for the proposed staffing levels for these reviewers will be evaluated also.

M-8.1.3.3. The Government will evaluate the offeror's access to, and ability to obtain, licensed, actively-practicing physician reviewers board-certified in all specialties recognized by the American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) or the Bureau of Osteopathic Specialists (BOS), and non-physicians reviewers.

M-8.1.3.4. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach to ensure that its staff are appropriately qualified by education, training, and experience. The offeror's procedures for ensuring that its staff are appropriately credentialed, along with its approach for ensuring that staff maintain the required qualifications and certifications while performing under this contract, will be evaluated.

M-8.1.4. Factor 1 - Management, Subfactor 4 - Internal Quality Management Program (IQMP)

M-8.1.4.1. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed process and plans for its Internal Quality Management Program (IQMP), to include any external certifications and accreditations, and compliance therewith.

M-8.1.4.2. The offeror's integration of its Internal Quality Management Program into this effort, and how the offeror's integration of the IQMP will ensure accuracy and timeliness, will be assessed.

M-8.1.4.3. The Government will evaluate the offeror's processes to ensure that it satisfies the staff training and internal audits and management control programs requirements.

M-9. EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL APPROACH

M-9.1. Each technical proposal will be evaluated according to the evaluation factors and subfactors stated herein. Failure to address any of the specified

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

technical subfactor requirements will be considered a deficiency. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of how well an offeror's proposed procedures, methods, and delivery of services meet the Government's minimum requirement. If proposing enhancements, the offeror must highlight in writing the enhancement and describe the added benefit to the Government. Each proposal will be evaluated separately and will be evaluated solely on its own merits.

M-9.1.1. Factor 2 - Technical Approach, Subfactor 1 - Case Reviews

M-9.1.1.1. The offeror's approach to identifying services that are not a TRICARE benefit will be evaluated.

M-9.1.1.2. The offeror's approach to providing consistent and standardized reviews will be assessed.

M-9.1.1.3. The offeror's methods for evaluating that the MCSCs and DPs are performing preauthorization, retrospective, and pre-payment reviews consistent with TRICARE requirements will be evaluated.

M-9.1.1.4. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach to assessing medical necessity and appropriateness of services, and to identifying preventable admissions.

M-9.1.1.5. The offeror's approach to applying quality screens and medical judgment, when identifying quality issues, using process and outcome measures that focus on the delivery of health care, will be evaluated.

M-9.1.1.6. The offeror's approach to identifying, measuring, and evaluating superior health care services, to include the offeror's recommendation approach to transferring identified successes, will be assessed.

M-9.1.1.7. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach to validating DRGs and RUGs.

M-9.1.1.8. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach to ensuring that all potential quality concerns, utilization concerns, inappropriate medical care, preventable admissions, or potential fraud and abuse are confirmed by a board certified, licensed physician, who is actively practicing in the technical area being reviewed.

M-9.1.2. Factor 2 - Technical Approach, Subfactor 2 - Facility Certification

M-9.1.2.1. The offeror's approach to certifying and monitoring of the RTCs, SUDRFs, and PHPs, will be assessed. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach to documenting findings of the facility certification reviews.

M-9.1.2.2. The offeror's approach to conducting reconsideration of denials for facility certifications will be assessed.

M-10. EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE

M-10.1. Past performance will be evaluated utilizing the information obtained from past performance documentation furnished with the proposal and information obtained from other sources. Assessing an offeror's past performance is a key method of evaluating the credibility of an offeror's proposal and their capability to meet performance requirements.

M-10.2. The Government will evaluate past performance relevant to the work to be accomplished under this solicitation. The outcome is to determine a confidence level in an offeror's ability to successfully perform all requirements. An offeror's description of its past performance, the reports and findings, the references provided (including appraisals completed by the references), and the submitted key personnel experience information will be used to develop a performance confidence level. Providing references that cannot be contacted by the Government may impact the past performance evaluation of an offeror.

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M-10.3. If an offeror has no past performance history relating to the requirements stipulated in this RFP, the offeror's past performance rating will be neutral and will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably. This rating is neither negative nor positive. Neutral is merely indicative of a lack of prior performance in the area of the requirements as outlined in this RFP. If an offeror submits applicable past performance information from a predecessor company or from a partner or consortium member, this information will be considered in rendering a performance confidence level rating. This rating will be based on the amount of past performance, its applicability to the requirements of this RFP, and the amount of control the partner or consortium member had in the daily operations of the offeror. An offeror shall submit past performance information on its key personnel where no other past performance information is available. The Government will also utilize its own records relating to predecessor companies, partners, consortium members, or key personnel where applicable and relevant. The Government will consider this information in rendering a past performance rating. This rating will be based on the employee's role in the company and the amount of past performance the employee had related to the requirements of this RFP. Irrespective of whether the past performance data relates to a partner, consortium member, or an employee or group of employees, the Government may still render a performance confidence level of neutral if convincing and relevant past performance information is not available. If the foregoing information is not available, the Government may use relevant past performance information of subcontractors with a significant functional role in performing the contract. If the subcontractors do not have relevant past performance information, the performance confidence level will be assessed as neutral.

M-11. EVALUATION OF PRICE

M-11.1. All proposed prices will be evaluated for reasonableness and for unbalanced pricing. Proposed prices will be evaluated for contract award purposes on a total price basis. The Government will calculate a total evaluated price as stated below. Only the highest proposed phase-out price will be included in the total evaluated price. The proposal will be evaluated for compliance with instructions, conditions, and notices contained in Section L.

M-11.2. The total evaluated price will consist of the proposed fixed total price for the transition-in period, the proposed fixed unit price for each category of service or report applied to the respective estimated quantity established by the Government in Section B for each CLIN for each option period, the highest proposed fixed total phase-out price, and the firm-fixed prices for the Information System Certification and Accreditation, Physical Security, and Personnel Security for the base period and each option period.

M-11.3. The supporting cost information submitted for the Security CLINs will be used in performing a cost realism analysis. Results of this analysis will be used to assess the offeror's proposal risk.

(End of Section)